

got out of all the vast expenditure for war was the merchant marine—12,000,000 tons of shipping—and he thought America would be able to handle it. He failed to turn this asset to the practical use of American business. As for the railways he asked them to note that the Republican party had not committed to a policy of Americanization of the railways.

In the first half of the address Harding reviewed the miseries of home business, little and big, under "a national regime" which "placed its bungling hands upon the throat, tinkering with it, experimenting with it, abusing it and treating it with suspicion."

He called attention to the fact that small business, not big business, is the foundation of the country's prosperity, and that it is small business that has suffered so bitterly.

#### His Speech in Full.

The speech in full follows:

"I am a small business man, and through you I would like to send a message to all those Americans whose interest in American business is the same as mine. We are the small business nation of the world. We should be able to save that business and prosper it by a fair measure of common sense, and we ought and must do it. We will not let the able and honest men whom fortune may surround by the Republican party. We will restore representative government and reduce the distended executive powers and extreme centralization which nearly eight years of mismanaged Democracy has brought us. We will preserve a willingness to listen to the will of the people, and will continue the desire for a common good fortune to most of the necessary good fortune of business, which is the life blood of material existence.

"American business is not big business. While it has been in those persons in distended power over our national affairs who have spoken of American business as if it were a large and selfish interest seeking special privileges, and who, on that basis, have put their bungling hands upon its throat and tried tinkering and experimenting with it and abusing it and treating it with suspicion. Let us put an end to holding success to be a crime.

"We have seen the result of this reckless, selfish course during these years of regime which, though a few men who are in 'perfect accord' seek to perpetuate it, the American people mean to put to an end with a sigh of relief and the exclamation, 'That's over at last!'

"It will be the American people who will do this because American business is everybody's business. Nearly nine-tenths of those who depend for their living and the legitimate fruits of their labor in American manufacturing are the wage earners. The blow directed at American business, the pulling and hauling of American business by weird economic and social theories applied by an Administration which could not even run its own business, is less menacing, for instance, to the small business of manufacturing as business executives than it is to the nine-tenths who are our American laborers, and who begin to realize that another year or two of the group who are in 'perfect accord' will mean for American labor the 'no hour day.'

"The big business of America is the little business of America. The last available census figures show that more than sixty per cent. of our manufacturers, which I use as an example, were little plants, the smallest of which turned out more than \$100,000 of products. Only twenty-five per cent. of our plants were even doing business as corporations. The average number of workers employed was twenty-five. When we come to analyze what we mean by American business we find out that we mean the daily work of the nation, most of it undertaken in the factory on the farm in small units. We find out that we mean the business of the home and of the household, and that American business is everybody's business. It is more than that. It is the work of every worker, clothes for his or her back, food for his or her mouth. And when this bungling Administration now seeks to perpetuate itself in 'perfect accord,' let us remember that its suspicion of business, and the use of its extraordinary war powers and its Socialist tendencies have been bullying and tinkering with the pocketbooks of all the American people. When I hear the voices of the present spokesmen of that regime talking about being progressive I recall the activity made in every direction except forward, and especially that which has drawn us close to an economic business predicament.

#### Must Face New Tasks.

"The day of that kind of progress is about at an end. We must face the new tasks. We have had a fever of high prices and excessive production, put of the sacrificed billions of treasure and millions of lives, but the reconstruction must be better business, founded on unchanging principle. We must summon the best abilities of America to put America back on the main road, and to remove the debris of the last eight years, and to keep our industries running, and to restore the proper ratio of prosperity to our American agriculture so that it can again bid for good American standard labor. The day of the one-man war-power fiasco of government must yield to the sound practice of the republic.

"If our memory is directed again to 1914, when the 'new freedom' brought us to the verge of paralysis, we will recall that world war alone saved us from a disaster in peace. We were sharpening our wits in competition with the world, as the President then expressed it, but we dulled our capacity to buy, then war saved us psychologically and commercially, but to-day we are at peace, actual though not proclaimed, and our problems are the problems of peace.

"We must always exact from ourselves and our business high, honorable and fair dealing by law, and by law's right enforcement when necessary, but we must repeal and wipe out a mass of executive orders and laws which, falling to serve effectively that purpose, serve only to leave American business in anxiety, uncertainty and darkness.

"We must readjust our tariff, and this time with especial regard for the new economic menaces to our American agriculture as well as factory.

"We must readjust our internal taxation, especially the excess profits tax, to remove the burden it imposes upon the will to create and produce, whether that will is the will of the big corporation, the small corporation or of the individual.

"We must uproot from our national Government the yearning to undertake enterprises and experiments which were never intended as the work of our Government, and which have proved ineffective to a point which sickens us all, and that our Government is incapable of performing without wreckage or chaos. Of necessity the machinery of government expands as we grow in numbers as a people, but before government expands in bureaucratic control of business its sponsors ought first demonstrate a capacity to conduct the business of the Government. When government itself has a budget of more than three billions a year, in times of peace, it has a business of its own to look after—and it needs looking after—without sending new fields to conquer until it has proved capacity for the tasks it must perform.

"We must, instead of such experiments, establish a closer understanding between American government and American business, so that one may serve the other and the other obey and seek cooperation.

"We must give government cooperation to business, we must protect American business at home, and we must aid and protect it abroad by the upbuilding of our merchant marine and a restoration of our self-respecting measure of American protection to her citizens wherever they may go upon righteous errands.

"We must build our economic life into new strength and we must do it so that

our prosperity shall not be the prosperity of profiteers or of special privilege.

"We must do it so that abroad we are known not as a nation struggling under a plumage of the world, but as one that initiates friendly and peaceful relations by the shuttle of honorable deeds.

"We must do it so that at home our economic life yields opportunity to every man not to have that which he has not earned, whether he be the capitalist or the most humble laborer, but to have a share in prosperity based upon his own merit, capacity and worth—under the eternal spirit of 'America First.'

"American business has suffered from staggering blows because of too much ineffective meddling by government, and it is equally true that good government has almost been allowed to die on our hands because it has not utilized the first sound principles of American business.

"The Government of the United States of this nation of ours, which should be an example of American good sense and sound organization, has been allowed to degenerate into an inadequate piece of administrative machinery. While we have heard preaching to all the nations of the earth, which, to put it mildly, has been adequate indeed, the back of our leadership has been turned to the world in the conduct of our own affairs. I refer only to the deplorable impairment which has been given our time-tested democratic institutions by robbing our representative government of its place in our Republic in order to fatten administrative authority and replace the will of the people by the will of a few. I refer not only to the conspiracy of 'perfect accord' by which it is hoped to perpetuate this power, I am referring now to the fact that not only in the Government have we been treated out of shape, been dictatorial and meddling and have been extending its activity to experiments beyond its powers, but also to the fact that it has blundered in every direction.

"It has engaged in prodigious waste. The American people pay. It has kept its overstaffed bureaus and departments, many of which are doing overlapping work, in a prime condition of reckless inefficiency. The American people pay. It has a record in the appointment of campaign contributors and diplomats who have been without previous experience in foreign affairs. The American people pay. It has engaged in all kinds of costly bungling experiments of Government management and ownership of enterprises which other management could do better. The American people pay. It has allowed worthy federal employees, particularly those who are skilled, such as chemists and agricultural experts, to go so badly paid by the Government that they have left the service. The American people have to bear the cost. It has poured forth our national treasure into the yawning maw of the Government, and has shown the greatest capacity for administrative vision. We mean to call that administrative quality and vision to the service of the Government, and establish an advance in government business, not merely talk about government progress.

"Conditions are calling, capabilities await, the needs are urgent and we pledge a Republican administration to inaugurate a new order—a business government, with business efficiency, and a business concern for public approval.

"Because I am speaking to business men, and because they have a special appreciation of the importance of clearness in their contracts, I have a very special matter to mind and I want to speak to you about today. Incidentally, it ought to be said that one of the most important things in the relationship of men is the keeping of contracts. We must perform our legal obligations with great fidelity, and we must always hold our moral obligations as inviolable. If every one keeps his contracts faithfully there would not be many conflicts among either the peoples or the nations of the world.

"The special matter which I have in mind relates to the ambiguity, or the

a Republican Congress and vetoed, we must put into force.

"We must put our postwar system upon a new basis.

"We must extend the merit system in the choice and promotion of Federal employees.

"We must not only stop the useless jobs being done, but we must also reward efficiency and value among our public service employees that we may continue to have their loyalty because we have given decent pay and the expectation of promotion when promotion is earned.

"We must conduct a careful scrutiny of our great executive departments to plan so that similar laborers shall not be duplicated and so that similar functions shall be grouped and not scattered.

"We must go to men who know, for advice in administrative improvement; we must have to aid us more men trained in agriculture, more technical men, more men who know business and the practices of commerce and trade.

"We must organize our administrative government upon the basis of American business, so that the faith of the American people in the common sense of a Republican party to put America into shape again shall not have been misplaced.

"I look upon the responsibility of an executive officer as being based first of all upon his ability, together with that of capable men called to execute. An executive officer of any other than Government business would be discharged if he allowed paralysis and perversion of the functioning of that business while he and his followers were engaged in addressing advice to the neighbors.

"Let them who say that the American people are not awake to these matters take new counsel. The Government is the people's business, and they will not only in the Government have been treated out of shape, been dictatorial and meddling and have been extending its activity to experiments beyond its powers, but also to the fact that it has blundered in every direction.

"This great Federal machine has grown up in a century of haphazard expansion, until, as recently described, it resembles an antiquated central building with a large number of surrounding sheds and cottages, overcrowded with overlapping officials and saturated with methods of organization and administration fully fifty years behind the times.

"An eminent Senator once said he could substitute his private business methods for Government practices and save hundreds of millions of dollars. We might treble the figures for the saving now.

"Democracy has done nothing in eight years to cure the waste and inefficiency it has rather added to them. We are the ineffective prodigals of the world.

"Here in America we have developed the most proficient and most efficient types of business organization and administration in the world; they have shown the greatest capacity for administrative vision. We mean to call that administrative quality and vision to the service of the Government, and establish an advance in government business, not merely talk about government progress.

"Conditions are calling, capabilities await, the needs are urgent and we pledge a Republican administration to inaugurate a new order—a business government, with business efficiency, and a business concern for public approval.

"Because I am speaking to business men, and because they have a special appreciation of the importance of clearness in their contracts, I have a very special matter to mind and I want to speak to you about today. Incidentally, it ought to be said that one of the most important things in the relationship of men is the keeping of contracts. We must perform our legal obligations with great fidelity, and we must always hold our moral obligations as inviolable. If every one keeps his contracts faithfully there would not be many conflicts among either the peoples or the nations of the world.

"The special matter which I have in mind relates to the ambiguity, or the

conflict of terms. In a very important contract which it has been proposed that America shall enter upon with other leading nations of the world, if the agent of a business establishment should negotiate so contradictory an agreement an explanation would be called for very quickly.

"Some of you will recall that Mr. Lansing, who was then Secretary of State, and who was in a position to know pretty intimately about what was going on during the negotiations at Paris, made the very frank statement that if the American people knew what the Versailles covenant would let them in for they never would stand for its adoption. It was for such frank expressions, and like fidelity to America, that Secretary Lansing was retired from the service at the moment of his highest need to our country. I want to point out to you, and through you to America, one of the dangerous things Secretary Lansing was thinking about when he was speaking for our nation. I am sure it is a contradiction that no business man would tolerate in a contract to which he is expected to append his signature.

"The thing in mind is the consideration given to the great Monroe Doctrine by the league covenant and the very evident possibility—if not, indeed, a probability—of the necessary abandonment of that doctrine by this country if we had entered upon the covenant negotiated by the President. I do not presume to give to you an explanation as to the source of contradictions or the probable intent thereof. However, the plain facts are that in the first draft of the league covenant, the Monroe Doctrine, that strong declaration of a great national policy which we have cherished for more than one hundred years, was ignored entirely. When the President made his brief visit at home, between periods of negotiations, he discovered that America would never consent to 'surrender' the Monroe Doctrine; that America was very strongly committed to the upholding of this doctrine, and held it in little less reverence than the American Constitution itself. So, on his return to Paris, the President made, or pretended to make, a concession to the reverence of the American people. The concession was made in connection with Article XXI. The official copies of the league covenant, executed by the various plenipotentiaries, including our own, were printed in both English and French, in parallel columns. The signatures to the covenant were appended beneath these parallel columns, and very naturally the council of the league, containing no vote from the United States, would have been called upon to settle it. Can any one doubt that the decision would have followed the original French text, which is by universal recognition the official language of diplomacy? America would have had to acquiesce in the demolition of her cherished doctrine or go to war, contrary to her own solemn pledge, to sustain that doctrine.

"One cannot help but wonder whether

"Comparing the two versions of this solemn covenant, no one can fail to perceive that one text is the complete reversal of the other. The English translation pretends to say that nothing in the covenant shall affect the validity of the Monroe Doctrine, while the original version in French asserts very plainly that engagements like the Monroe Doctrine 'are not considered as incompatible with any of the provisions of the present pact.'

"Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

"This is the quotation from the English text as proclaimed to America and alluded to as the one outstanding expression which safeguards the Monroe Doctrine. But it really does nothing of the sort, for it is a very flagrant misrepresentation of what the Monroe Doctrine really is. The Monroe Doctrine is not an 'international engagement' nor a 'treaty of arbitration' nor a 'regional understanding.' It is a plain, square, fearless declaration of the United States which is a warning against European nations exerting undue influence or applying improper pressure upon the helpless republics of the Western Hemisphere. Indeed, it is America's warning to the Old World against foreign aggression, for our own protection and for the protection of those who have a right to look to this republic for an effective manifestation of neighborly interest.

"But this is not the main ambiguity in the contract. The point I really wish to stress is the difference between the French and the English text, which might very readily involve us in unhappy conflict. The French text is quoted as follows:

#### Quotes French Text.

"Les engagements internationaux, tels que les traités d'arbitrage,

et les ententes régionales, comme la Doctrine de Monroe, qui assurent le maintien de la paix, ne sont considérés comme incompatibles avec aucune des dispositions du présent pacte."

"Translators say that the French is so simple and lucid that one can read it without being a master of the language and understand it perfectly. The literal translation reads as follows:

"International engagements, such as treaties of arbitration, and regional understandings, like the Monroe Doctrine, which assure the maintenance of peace, are not considered as incompatible with any of the provisions of the present pact."

"Comparing the two versions of this solemn covenant, no one can fail to perceive that one text is the complete reversal of the other. The English translation pretends to say that nothing in the covenant shall affect the validity of the Monroe Doctrine, while the original version in French asserts very plainly that engagements like the Monroe Doctrine 'are not considered as incompatible with any of the provisions of the present pact.'

"Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

"This is the quotation from the English text as proclaimed to America and alluded to as the one outstanding expression which safeguards the Monroe Doctrine. But it really does nothing of the sort, for it is a very flagrant misrepresentation of what the Monroe Doctrine really is. The Monroe Doctrine is not an 'international engagement' nor a 'treaty of arbitration' nor a 'regional understanding.' It is a plain, square, fearless declaration of the United States which is a warning against European nations exerting undue influence or applying improper pressure upon the helpless republics of the Western Hemisphere. Indeed, it is America's warning to the Old World against foreign aggression, for our own protection and for the protection of those who have a right to look to this republic for an effective manifestation of neighborly interest.

"But this is not the main ambiguity in the contract. The point I really wish to stress is the difference between the French and the English text, which might very readily involve us in unhappy conflict. The French text is quoted as follows:

"Les engagements internationaux, tels que les traités d'arbitrage,

et les ententes régionales, comme la Doctrine de Monroe, qui assurent le maintien de la paix, ne sont considérés comme incompatibles avec aucune des dispositions du présent pacte."

complete abandonment. The President and the other American plenipotentiaries signed both of these texts in committing this republic to the league covenant. It is not difficult to see what the result would have been if the Senate had been driven into unqualified ratification.

"Inevitably some question involving the integrity of the Monroe Doctrine would have soon arisen, with an apparent conflict between this cherished American doctrine and the league covenant. Americans would naturally have said: 'The doctrine must stand unimpaired; for the covenant says that nothing in the covenant shall affect the doctrine.' Any European Power might have replied in good reason: 'No, the doctrine must give way to the covenant, for the covenant says nothing in the doctrine shall be considered incompatible with the treaty.' Each side would have been right, according to its version of the language in the treaty. The question which version is correct would, of course, have been raised incidentally, and in the words of Lord Cecil, the council of the league, containing no vote from the United States, would have been called upon to settle it. Can any one doubt that the decision would have followed the original French text, which is by universal recognition the official language of diplomacy? America would have had to acquiesce in the demolition of her cherished doctrine or go to war, contrary to her own solemn pledge, to sustain that doctrine.

"One cannot help but wonder whether

"Comparing the two versions of this solemn covenant, no one can fail to perceive that one text is the complete reversal of the other. The English translation pretends to say that nothing in the covenant shall affect the validity of the Monroe Doctrine, while the original version in French asserts very plainly that engagements like the Monroe Doctrine 'are not considered as incompatible with any of the provisions of the present pact.'

"Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

"This is the quotation from the English text as proclaimed to America and alluded to as the one outstanding expression which safeguards the Monroe Doctrine. But it really does nothing of the sort, for it is a very flagrant misrepresentation of what the Monroe Doctrine really is. The Monroe Doctrine is not an 'international engagement' nor a 'treaty of arbitration' nor a 'regional understanding.' It is a plain, square, fearless declaration of the United States which is a warning against European nations exerting undue influence or applying improper pressure upon the helpless republics of the Western Hemisphere. Indeed, it is America's warning to the Old World against foreign aggression, for our own protection and for the protection of those who have a right to look to this republic for an effective manifestation of neighborly interest.

"But this is not the main ambiguity in the contract. The point I really wish to stress is the difference between the French and the English text, which might very readily involve us in unhappy conflict. The French text is quoted as follows:

"Les engagements internationaux, tels que les traités d'arbitrage,

the whole thing was a trap to destroy the good American doctrine of Monroe, to which this republic has been committed for more than a century. It is impossible to believe that the English version was intended to be an exact rendering of the French; no one will consent to believe it was meant to be identical in purport. In short, we were starting out with an ambiguity which in itself might readily be the first basis of controversy and involve us with the nations of the Old World. One wishes to be both charitable and considerate, but it is a hard to believe that this very marked discrepancy was perpetrated without intention. Clearly, either America is being deceived or the representatives of America have sought to deceive the nations with whom we propose to covenant our peaceful associations.

"It is surely a matter of business prudence, therefore, that we propose to bring about disarmament and commit the conscience of nations to maintained peace. Nobody is proposing to hold aloof from the onward procession of humanity. On the contrary, it is our part to be conspicuous in leading to new achievements. We mean to lift the voice of America to outlaw war and settle controversies between nations as become to devote of peace. In seeking this great advance, we do not mean to begin on a foundation which is of itself an encouragement to controversy, but we want to start with that clarity of understanding whereby we know America is right and which may hold us resolute and unafraid."

"One cannot help but wonder whether

"Comparing the two versions of this solemn covenant, no one can fail to perceive that one text is the complete reversal of the other. The English translation pretends to say that nothing in the covenant shall affect the validity of the Monroe Doctrine, while the original version in French asserts very plainly that engagements like the Monroe Doctrine 'are not considered as incompatible with any of the provisions of the present pact.'

"Nothing in this covenant shall be deemed to affect the validity of international engagements, such as treaties of arbitration or regional understandings like the Monroe Doctrine, for securing the maintenance of peace."

"This is the quotation from the English text as proclaimed to America and alluded to as the one outstanding expression which safeguards the Monroe Doctrine. But it really does nothing of the sort, for it is a very flagrant misrepresentation of what the Monroe Doctrine really is. The Monroe Doctrine is not an 'international engagement' nor a 'treaty of arbitration' nor a 'regional understanding.' It is a plain, square, fearless declaration of the United States which is a warning against European nations exerting undue influence or applying improper pressure upon the helpless republics of the Western Hemisphere. Indeed, it is America's warning to the Old World against foreign aggression, for our own protection and for the protection of those who have a right to look to this republic for an effective manifestation of neighborly interest.

"But this is not the main ambiguity in the contract. The point I really wish to stress is the difference between the French and the English text, which might very readily involve us in unhappy conflict. The French text is quoted as follows:

"Les engagements internationaux, tels que les traités d'arbitrage,

# The Bigness of New York

NO CITY is self-contained and independent. New York does not and cannot exist by itself alone. It is big—so big that it must depend upon the entire State. It lives and grows and becomes greater each day with the aid of the other communities in this State. It is dependent upon the produce and the products of these communities. Day after day their men and women must toil by thousands to enable the greatest city of the Western World to carry on. Their pastures, their farms, their forests, their factories and their mills must all give of their output to the Metropolis, or else millions of people within the city must suffer.

ALL roads lead to the modern Rome. They not only lead to it, but they lead out from it to the centers of trade and industry and agriculture upon which this city depends. These roads are its highways, rivers, canals, railroads, telegraph and telephone wires. They reach the large communities and the small communities.

And of these none is greater than the telephone.

Its service is quick, direct and personal.

It keeps New York in touch with its sources of supplies.

Daily and hourly it carries the orders and directs and watches the transportation and conduct of business, big and little, with a speed and sureness that saves New York millions of dollars.

It is invaluable.

The New York of today could no more do without the service of the state-wide telephone system than it could do without transportation. The city and the state are so closely related and their interests so finely interwoven that it is not possible to separate them.

This state-wide system of telephone communication must:

- Serve all communities in the State.
- Bring them all together into one neighborhood.
- Give everyone adequate service at reasonable cost.

To do their part to keep this system adequate the communities of the State outside the City are paying higher rates. Now the City itself, the one community that benefits most, is asked to do its part to maintain and develop this great system—this highway that has done so much to make New York big.

Not only *must* it be maintained. It *must* be expanded. New markets, new industrial plants, new activities of all kinds are constantly springing up in out of the way corners. Before the wheels have begun to turn the telephone must be there ready to serve them and you—ready to make them a smoothly functioning part of the great industrial fabric that is New York.

## New York Telephone Company

## Consider the False Economy Of Baking Bread at Home

First you have to buy flour, sugar, milk and all the rest of the ingredients used and which cost three and four times what they did a few years ago.

Then consider the cost of fuel used in baking, whether it be gas, coal, wood or electricity.

Consider your time and the long, hot, hard hours of bread baking labor.

Consider the waste of costly food material if you have a baking failure.

Consider, too, how home baking adds to your worries on the servant question.

Consider all these things and compare your certain expense and doubtful results with the alternative of buying from your dealer fresh and fragrant every morning

# WARD'S Mother Hubbard BREAD

the milk loaf with that fine, wholesome wheat flavor which brings back to mind your mother's kind.

WARD'S MOTHER HUBBARD BREAD is truly a loaf which will recall all the good things about home-made bread days and satisfy and nourish every member of the family, minus all the trouble and worry.

Slices, butters, eats well, keeps moist and MAKES THE MOST DELICIOUS TOAST YOU EVER TASTED.

Wrapped and sealed in waxed paper to bring it to your table fresh and clean.

Your choice of two sizes—large and small loaves.